1 2 3 4 5	JEREMY JOHNSON 529 South Woods View Circle St. George, UT 84770 Phone: (435) 817-8299 Email: documentcollection02203@gmail.com Pro Se Defendant		
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
9	FOR THE DISTI	I	
10			
11	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	Case No.: 2:10-CV-02203-MMD-GWF	
12	Plaintiff(s)		
13	v.		
14	JEREMY JOHNSON, et al.		
15	Defendant(s)		
16	STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF T	IME FOR PRO SE DEFENDANT JEREMY	
17	JOHNSON TO REPLY TO FTC'S AND RECEIVER'S OPPOSITION TO PRO SE DEFENDANT JEREMY JOHNSON'S MOTION FOR		
18		OLIATION OF EVIDENCE	
19	COMES NOW, Pro Se Defendant Jeremy Johnson, and hereby makes this Stipulation for		
20	Extension of Time for Pro Se Defendant Jeremy Johnson to Reply to FTC's and Receiver's		
21	Opposition to Pro Se Defendant Jeremy Johnson's Motion for Sanctions Due to Spoliation of		
22			
23	Evidence as follows:		
24	1. On December 8, 2015, Mr. Johnson filed his Motion for Sanctions Due to		
25	Spoliation of Evidence. [DE 1763]		
26	2. On December 28, 2015, the FTC and the Receiver filed their oppositions to Mr.		
27 28	Johnson's Motion for Sanctions Due to Spoliation	on of Evidence. [DE 1809, DE 1810]	
20			

- 3. Mr. Johnson's Reply to the FTC's and Receiver's Opposition is due January 7, 2016.
- 4. During a Telephonic Status Conference with the Court on December 29, 2015, the Court ordered the Receiver's counsel to file a request, as the Receiver's counsel proposed, with the Court that outlines the terms under which the Zeus server may be released to FBI Special Agent Randy Kim so that the server may be cloned if the Court in Utah determines it is appropriate for the agent to clone it. The Court then stated that any party who wished to object to the release of the Zeus server to the FBI had to do so within seven days of the filing of the Receiver's proposed terms and conditions. [DE 1811]
- 5. On December 30, 2015, the Receiver filed an Emergency Motion for Order Authorizing Receiver to Release Custody of the Zeus Server to Special Agent Kim of the FBI for Cloning. [DE 1813]
- 6. Any objections to the terms and conditions proposed by the Receiver in its Motion for Order Authorizing Receiver to Release Custody of the Zeus Server to Special Agent Kim of the FBI for Cloning were due to be filed on January 6, 2016. No parties, including Mr. Johnson, filed an objection to the Receiver's terms and conditions for turning the Zeus server over to Agent Kim for cloning as set forth in the Receiver's motion.
- 7. On January 5, 2016, Mr. Johnson reached out to the FTC and the Receiver regarding a stipulation for extension of time for Mr. Johnson to Reply to the FTC's and Receiver's opposition to Mr. Johnson's Motion for Sanctions Due to Spoliation of Evidence. In an email addressed to Ms. Guerard and Mr. Caris, Mr. Johnson asked whether the FTC and the Receiver would agree to extend Mr. Johnson's time to reply until after Agent Kim performed his analysis of the Zeus server. As a basis for his request, Mr. Johnson stated that, if Agent Kim's findings were

different than what Mr. Johnson has alleged in his Motion for Sanctions Due to Spoliation of Evidence, then he would be inclined to withdraw his current motion, and/or include any new information from Agent Kim in his Reply. *See* Exhibit 1, Email to Ms. Guerard and Mr. Caris, 1/5/16.

8. In responsive emails, both Ms. Guerard and Mr. Caris have agreed to Mr. Johnson's request for an extension of time for Mr. Johnson to file his Reply. *See* Exhibit 2, Responsive Emails from Ms. Guerard and Mr. Caris, 1/5/16. Mr. Caris suggested a thirty-day extension, or until February 8, 2016, for Mr. Johnson to file his Reply, with such extension to be without prejudice to Mr. Johnson's right to seek a further extension of the deadline to reply if Agent Kim has not completed his analysis by the February 8, 2016 deadline. *Id*.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto do stipulate and agree that the deadline for Pro Se Defendant Jeremy Johnson to file his Reply to the FTC's and Receiver's Opposition to Pro Se Defendant Jeremy Johnson's Motion for Sanction Due to Spoliation of Evidence shall be extended to February 8, 2016, without prejudice to Mr. Johnson's right to seek a further extension of the deadline to reply if Agent Kim has not completed his analysis by February 8, 2016 deadline.

WHEREFORE, Pro Se Defendant Jeremy Johnson, the FTC, and the Receiver pray this Honorable Court endorse this Stipulation as outlined herein and set forth below.

DATED this 7<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2016.

Respectfully submitted by,

/s/ Jeremy Johnson Pro Se Defendant

## "Case 2:10-cv-02203-MMD-GWF Document 1825 Filed 01/08/16 Page 4 of 9

1	Dated: January 7, 2016	FEDE	ERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2		By: _	/s/ Collot Guerard Collot Guerard
3			Collot Guerard
4 5			Attorney for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission
6	D . 1 I . 7 2016	DECE	
7	Dated: January 7, 2016	RECE	EIVER
8		By:	/s/ Gary Owen Caris Gary Owen Caris
9			Attorney for Receiver
10			Robb Evans of Robb Evans & Associates LLC
11			
12			
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	_	
15			
16	DATED: January 7, 2016		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

# **EXHIBIT 1**

### Case 2:10-cv-02203-MMD-GWF Document 1825 Filed 01/08/16 Page 6 of 9

Subject: Stipulation to extend time to respond

Date: Tuesday, January 5, 2016 at 12:57:54 PM Mountain Standard Time

From: Jeremy Johnson

To: Guerard, Collot, Caris, Gary

Collot, Gary,

Would you agree to extend the time for my reply to your objection to the motion for sanctions until after agent Kim is able to make his analysis on the Zeus server? If his findings are something different than what I have alleged in the motion then I will be inclined to withdraw the motion or include the new information in my response. I assume the court would prefer to have an accurate accounting of what has happened to the server as well. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Jeremy

# **EXHIBIT 2**

**Subject:** RE: Stipulation to extend time to respond

**Date:** Tuesday, January 5, 2016 at 2:47:01 PM Mountain Standard Time

From: Guerard, Collot

To: 'Caris, Gary', Jeremy Johnson

**CC:** Brick Kane, Hawes, Lesley Anne, Guerard, Collot

Attachments: image001.png

I agree with the approach, but please circulate to Gary & me the proposed stipulation before filing it to make certain we agree.

**From:** Caris, Gary [mailto:gary.caris@dentons.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2016 4:44 PM

To: Jeremy Johnson

**Cc:** Guerard, Collot; Brick Kane; Hawes, Lesley Anne **Subject:** RE: Stipulation to extend time to respond

#### Jeremy:

The Receiver has no objection to your request, however I think we will need a specific date in the stipulation for the extension to file a reply. I suggest a 30-day extension (to February 8, 2016), and if you need more time, we can discuss another stipulated extension.

If Collot agrees with this approach, I suggest that you (Jeremy) prepare a proposed stipulation to this effect.

#### Gary

## Sary Owen Caris Partner

D +1 213 243 6107 | US Internal 36107

gary.caris@dentons.com

Bio Website

Assistant: Chris O'Meara +1 213 243 6003

Dentons US LLP

300 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 1400, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3124

大成 Salans FMC SNR Denton McKenna Long

Dentons is a global legal practice providing client services worldwide through its member firms and affiliates. This email may be confidential and protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, copying, distribution and use are prohibited; please notify us immediately and delete this copy from your system. Please see <u>dentons.com</u> for Legal Notices.

**From:** Jeremy Johnson [mailto:royalorangecat@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 05, 2016 11:58 AM

**To:** Guerard, Collot; Caris, Gary

**Subject:** Stipulation to extend time to respond

### Case 2:10-cv-02203-MMD-GWF Document 1825 Filed 01/08/16 Page 9 of 9

Collot, Gary,

Would you agree to extend the time for my reply to your objection to the motion for sanctions until after agent Kim is able to make his analysis on the Zeus server? If his findings are something different than what I have alleged in the motion then I will be inclined to withdraw the motion or include the new information in my response. I assume the court would prefer to have an accurate accounting of what has happened to the server as well. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Jeremy